

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, and 16-20 and 21-23 remain for reconsideration. Claims 2, 3, 5, and 9-10 were previously cancelled. Claims 6-8 and 11-15 are herein cancelled without prejudice.

Applicants note with appreciation the withdrawal of the previous grounds of rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on the combination of U.S. Patent 6,049,602 to Foladare in view of U.S. Patent 5,884,032 to Batemen and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,721,770 to Kohler.

In the present Office Action, all pending claims stand rejected on newly presented grounds. Specifically, all claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateman (previously of record) in view of newly cited U.S. Patents 5,742,675 to Kilander further in view of 6,614,896 to Rao.

This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed based on the following discussion.

Briefly, embodiments of the present invention are directed to providing

customer service support and, more particularly, to a call back system wherein the customer does not have to wait on hold to speak to an agent (e.g., customer service representative).

As discussed in the application, many older customer call centers still in use do not have call-back or web capabilities (page 5, lines 10-15). Thus, the customer must wait on hold for the next available agent. It is very costly to upgrade these call centers.

As shown in Figure 7, embodiments of the present invention provide a telephony server which can cost effectively provide non-call back call centers with call back capabilities without need of costly upgrades. When a customer calls for service or requests service via a web page, the customer provides a call back phone number and may specify a particular problem. The call back numbers and corresponding problems are stored in a telephony server. The telephony server then calls the call center and waits for an agent (rather than the customer waiting on hold for the agent). In addition, the server may convert information about the customer into DTMF signals which is understood by the call center prompts. When an agent answers, the agent enters his/her ID, also via DTMF, such that the telephony server recognizes the agent as available. The telephony server can then call back the customer and bridge the call between the customer and the available agent. The server may also match the available agent having expertise with a particular problem to a particular call-back request. In this manner, the agent with the appropriate

skill set to solve the customer's particular problem may be selected to deal with the customer.

All claims as presented include the feature or functionality of the telephony server for detecting when an agent is available when the agent enters their DTMF identification thus providing a call back center not having call-back capabilities with call-back capabilities.

The primary reference to Bateman is relied upon for essentially teaching the claimed invention but for the telephony server being used to call the call center and wait for an available agent and determining the availability of the agent based on a dual tone multi frequency (DTMF) ID.

As previously noted in earlier Remarks, the call center in Bateman appears to already have call-back capabilities. Indeed at column 6, line 31 it is taught that a request for help is processed by the HTTP server 46 which, as shown in Figure 1, is part of the call center. When an agent is available, the customer requesting the call-back is called. In contrast, the call center in Applicant's invention does not have call back capabilities. Therefore, according to applicant's claimed invention a telephony server is used to call the call center and wait for an available agent. The availability of the agent being determined by detecting a DTMF ID entered when an available agent answers the phone. This is not taught or suggested by Bateman.

The newly cited reference to Kilander does not even teach a call center with calls back capabilities. It merely suggests a call center that connects incoming calls with presently available agents without the need for a separate telephone switch at all. As stated in the last sentence of the abstract, “*the call center controller establishes the direct call connection between the incoming call and a selected available call handling agent without the need for a separate private branch exchange (PBX) or automatic call distribution (ACD) switch*” (emphasis added). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Kilander teaches away from using the claimed telephony server for any purpose, let alone to provide call back capabilities in the present invention.

Finally, the third reference relied upon by the Examiner, Rao, appears to be directed to a system that already has an automatic call back feature, just as Bateman discussed above. The call back feature in this case is provided to the caller “free” of charge if they agree to listen to an advertisement. Thus, the advertising revenues are used to cover the cost of the call-back service. It is unclear what this has to do with the present invention.

In short, embodiments of the present invention provide for a call back center not having call-back capabilities with call-back capabilities. Neither Bateman, nor Kilander, nor Rao teach or suggest such a system. Bateman and Rao’s call centers already have call back capabilities. Kilandar does not have call-back capabilities at all. Thus, the combination of these three references cannot make a case of *prima facie* obviousness.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites “connecting a telephony server between a user station and a call center not having call back capabilities via a telephone switching network, the call center in communication with at least one agent station... the telephony server calling back the user station and bridging a call back between the user station and the available agent...” (emphasis added).

Independent claim 16 recites “the telephony server bridging a call-back from the available agent to the customer using the stored phone number corresponding to the problem” (emphasis added).

Finally, independent claim 21 recites “a call center to connect an incoming call to an agent telephone, the call center being without call-back capabilities;

a telephony server comprising:

a receiver for receiving a request for a call-back from a user over the internet; a dual tone multi frequency (DTMF) generator for encoding user information into DTMF commands understood by the call center; a transmitter to call the call center over the telephone network providing the DTMF commands; a DTMF detector for receiving a DTMF string entered by an agent answering the agent telephone to identify that the agent is available; and a bridge for calling back the user to connect the available agent to the user” (emphasis added).

The above features recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by

Application No. 09/750,025
Amendment dated December 23, 2004
Response to Office Action of October 4, 2004

Atty. Docket No. 42P10168
Examiner: Q. Nguyen
TC/A.U. 2642

the prior art of record. As such, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is requested that the application be reconsidered, that claims 1, 4, and 16-20 and 21-23 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to Intel's Deposit Account number 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 23, 2004

/Kevin A. Reif/

Kevin A. Reif
Reg. No. 36,381

INTEL
LF1-102
4050 Lafayette Center Drive
Chantilly, Virginia 20151
(703) 633-6834

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

23 DECEMBER 2004

Date of Deposit

Deborah L. Higham
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

DLH
Signature

12-23-04
Date